DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 301 075 HE 021 774

AUTHOR Fisher, James L.; And Others
TITLE Leadership Behaviors of Effective College Presidents.
SPONS AGENCY EXXON Education Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 50p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Characteristics; *College Presidents; Higher Education; *Leadership Qualities; National Surveys; Questionnaires

ABSTRACT

A national survey of college presidents sought to develop a profile of the leadership behaviors of effective college executives. First, a number of qualified observers (association heads, foundation heads, or scholars) and presidents were asked to nominate effective administrators as survey recipients. The resulting 412 nominees and a representative sample of 412 additional presidents were then surveyed for demographic data, leadership attitudes, and information on leadership behaviors. Responses revealed distinct differences in attitudes and behaviors between the two respondent groups, particularly concerning confidence. Based on the findings, these observations were made: (1) effective leaders both exude and engender confidence; (2) effectiveness and winning are inextricably linked; (3) effective leaders focus on goal achievement and the accomplishment of a vision; (4) the effective leader must be willing to work longer hours than anyone else; (5) effective leaders exercise self-control and restraint; and (6) effective leaders are independent and self-assured. It is concluded that while leadership styles differ, there are discernible behaviors and attitudes that separate them from their less effective counterparts. Survey statistics and instruments are appended. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED301075

LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS OF EFFECTIVE COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

Prepared by:

James L. Fisher, Ph.D.
President Emeritus
Council for Advancement and
Support of Education

Martha W. Tack, Ph.D.
Department of Educational Administration and Supervision
Bowling Green State University

Karen J. Wheeler, Ph.D. Candidate
Department of Educational Administration and Supervision
Bowling Green State University

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Paper Presented at the 1988 AERA Annual Meeting
New Orleans, Louisiana

This research effort was funded by the Exxon Education Foundation.

HE 021 774

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Martha W. Tack

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Unquestionably, there is a hunger in society today for compelling, creative leadership (Burns, 1978). As Fisher (1984) said, "Leadership will be a greater problem during the 1980s than inflation, increasing expenses, declining government support, curriculum rebuilding, or declining enrollments" (p. 16). Bennis and Nanus (1985) went on to say that, "The need was never so great . . . . If there was ever a moment in history when a comprehensive strategic view of leadership was needed . . . this is certainly it" (p. 2).

Moreover, in the higher education arena, scholars as well as members of constituent groups repeatedly call for assertive presidents who have the stamina, vision, and commitment to lead higher education institutions to a more prominent position in the 21st century. Even though the need is clear, it is startling that we know so little about the factors that influence effective presidential leadership. Until we know more about how to identify, train, and nurture effective presidents, we will be unable to resolve the leadership dilemma in which we now find ourselves.

With these issues in mind we, along with James L. Fisher, designed and conducted a nationwide research study to determine if there are any discernable differences in the way effective and representative (or typical) presidents behave in the leadership context. We were indeed fortunate to have the support of the Exxon Education Foundation for this venture.

In the narrative that follows, we have included additional information about why effective presidential leadership is needed in higher education, and some of the barriers to presidential effectiveness. We also have provided information about why we believe

this research is significant, a brief description of the research methodology used in conducting the study, an overview of our results, and some concluding remarks about our findings.

The Need for Effective Presidential Leadership

Knowledge about the effective college president can be compared to an iceberg, with less in the realm of the known than the unknown. Granted, there is information regarding the roles and functions of presidents as well as optimal relationships between presidents and their boards of trustees (Kerr, 1984). Data also are available related to presidential selection procedures (American Council on Education (ACE)/Association of Governing Boards for Universities and Colleges (AGB), 1986; Nason, 1984), presidential profiles (Bolman, 1965; Cohen & March, 1986; Ferrari, 1970), presidential assessment (Fisher & Quehl, 1984; Nason, 1980), the relationship of power and the presidency (Fisher, 1984), and a host of other themes. However, very little has been said about the leadership behaviors of effective college presidents.

Even though there is a need for effective leadership at every administrative level in postsecondary education, it is particularly critical at the presidential level. There is no question that the president is the one person who has the greatest opportunity to influence the course of his or her institution, to ensure the imminence of higher education in this country, and to see that higher education continues to make lasting societal contributions. When meeting the demands of various constituent groups, it is clearly the president who makes the difference (Kauffman, 1984).

The importance of presidential leadership as it relates to institutional well-being and higher education's vitality has been a consistent theme through the years. As Sharp (1984) stated when considering the presidency from a historical perspective:

> Presidential styles changed and management skills took different forms as institutions and society changed. But strong leadership never went out of style . . . the achievements that built institutions, guarded their integrity, expanded their services, were those inspired by effective leaders in the president's office. (p. 16)

Gale also noted, "History shows that a college or university might be elevated to a higher level of significance, continue on its traditional course, or begin on a slippery path toward failure as a direct result of the person selected by the board to lead its institution" (ACE/AGB, 1986, np). Likewise, Cowley (1980) illustrated the importance of the presidency when he said:

> . . . name a great American college or university, and you will find in its history a commanding leader or leaders who held its presidency. Name an institution with a brilliant but now-withered past, however, and you will probably have little difficulty in identifying the weak headmen presidents who have blocked its progress. Our American social systems, as well as our political systems, thrive or falter depending upon the quality of leadership. Colleges and universities, focal institutions in the life of the nation, need especially strong leaders. (p. 70)

There is general agreement that if higher education is to continue performing a vital societal function, presidents who are visionary and unafraid to take risks must be identified to head institutions and focus attention on the mission at hand. However, few individuals can be found who have the ability to lead rather than just manage. As Kerr (1982) said, the person selected to be the president is often the last one to be rejected from a long list of hopeful candidates.

Unfortunately, this may be the case because essential issues that differentiate leadership and management are not often considered when selecting a president; and the difference is indeed great. According to Weathersby (1973):

> Leadership is knowing where to go; management is knowing how to get there. Leadership is setting desirable objectives; management is discovering efficient methods of achieving these objectives. Leadership is charismatic, qualitative, idealistic; management is analytical, quantitative, pragmatic. Managerial tools are reproducible, exportable, and politically demonstrable; leadership is unique, innate, and amorphous (p. 4).

Moreover, successful leaders have come to realize that efficiency does not always signal effectiveness. As defined by Drucker (1967), efficiency is simply doing things right, while effectiveness is doing the right things. Likewise, Bennis and Nanus (1985) stated that efficiency represents ". . . activities of mastering routines . . ." while effectiveness is ". . . activities of vision and judgment . . ." (p. 21).

Barriers to Effective Presidential Leadership

In keeping with traditional management thought, the main areas of presidential responsibility include administrative affairs, planning, monitoring relationships, communicating with constituencies, forecasting, organizing, and interpreting (Belgum, 1970; Johnson, 1964). In addition, successful presidents serve as an honest conscience in determining how well the institutional mission is being realized (Shaw, 1980). They also have a certain amount of self-esteem (Gilli, 1976) as well as an acceptable style (Benezet, Katz, & Magnusson, 1981) and are expected to be creative, wise, masterful, energetic, and dynamic (Pruitt, 1974). To compound matters, Kauffman (1984) and Sharp (1984) noted problems with which presidents must grapple such as shifts in demographic profiles, national economic instability, the loss of automatic credibility, governance arrangements that confuse accountability, and misunderstandings about collegiality and democratic decision-making.

It is little wonder that, as Sharp (1984) concluded, "conditions of governance and administration [have] made it increasingly difficult for presidents to assert the dynamic, highly visible leadership of yesteryear" (pp. 12-13). When trying to cope with the pressures of presidential leadership, those holding the office must assume a wide array of roles and responsibilities. It is the president who oversees "everything from the institutional budget to the definition of campus priorities, to the proper functioning of the vending machines" (Pruitt, 1974, p. 37). Miller (1983) also said college presidents must fulfill a variety of responsibilities: from counselor and translator to facilitator and protagonist, custodian of intellectual

and physical property to enforcer of rules. Likewise, Burke (1977) described the president as a "planner and manager, lobbyist and politician, myth maker and myth breaker, leader and follower, mediator and negotiator, apologist and advocate . . ." (p. 401).

A major barrier to the exercise of effective leadership is that no one agrees on the definition of effectiveness. As Bennis and Nanus (1985) pointed out:

> . . . no clear and unequivocal understanding exists as to what distinguishes leaders from non-leaders, and perhaps more important, what distinguishes effective leaders from ineffective leaders, and effective organizations from ineffective organizations (p. 4).

Cameron and Whetten (1983) added that confusion about the term exists because "there is no best constituency to define effectiveness. The criteria used by different constituencies to define effectiveness often differ markedly, and spirited debates about which constituency's criteria are most valuable continue in the literature" (p. 270).

Significance of Research on Effective College Presidents

It should be clear by now that there is a need to know more about the leadership behaviors that contribute to effectiveness in the presidency. Although no set of guidelines can guarantee success, the identification of common characteristics of those persons viewed as effective can help increase the chances of a successful presidential search (Friedman, 1983). Also, current presidents or persons aspiring to such leadership positions can use the findings in evaluating their own effectiveness and in identifying areas needing further development.

Moreover, information about the leadership behaviors of those viewed as effective can be extremely helpful in the training of presidents. Clearly, it is through the accumulation of knowledge about leadership that the various roles of the president will be clearly understood, and training methods will become more effective (Yukl, 1981). As Burns (1978) noted:

> The study of leadership in general will be advanced by looking at leaders in particular. The development of certain leaders or rulers is described not in order to "solve" leadership problems or necessarily to predict what kind of leader a person might become, but to raise questions inherent in the complexity of the leadership processes. (p. 27)

Therefore, studies that attempt to identify common characteristics of effective leaders are not, as Jenkins (1947) suggested, an exercise in futility. In fact, according to Stogdill (1948), there is evidence indicating that "leadership patterns as well as non-leadership patterns of behavior are persistent and relatively stable" (p. 65). So although the study of presidential effectiveness is complex, it also is legitimate, worthwhile, and exciting.

Research Methodology

The major difficulty involved in studying effective leaders revolves around the identification process:

What criteria should be used?

Who is qualified to name effective leaders?

Should the assumption be made that effective institutions are led by effective chief executive officers?

With these questions in mind, we surveyed the literature to determine how previous studies had been conducted.

The results of our search for clues about how to design the study were startling. We found that no empirical studies, using college presidents as the focal point of the research, had ever been conducted to learn more about their leadership behaviors and attitudes. Interestingly, a few studies have been completed on effective institutions, with the researchers subsequently drawing conclusions about the behaviors and traits of the institutions' leaders (Astin & Scherrei, 1980; Gilley, Fulmer, & Reithlingshoefer, 1986; Whetten & Cameron, 1985). Given the limited activity in this area, we then turned to Stogdill's (1948) five suggested ways to study effective leaders: 1) observe the leader's behavior in a group setting; 2) ask associates (or peers) to vote for the people they believe have certain leadership traits; 3) request that qualified observers (those with educated judgments) nominate or rate people; 4) identify people in specific positions and then test or rate them; and 5) analyze biographical data and conduct case studies.

After thinking carefully about the research design, we decided to incorporate two of Stogdill's (1948) suggestions into the sample selection process, i.e., use of qualified observers and associates or peers. As a result, we asked 485 people to help us identify the most "effective" college presidents in America: 78 of these people were classified as qualified observers and 407 of the nominators were associates or current college presidents of two-year, four-year, public, and private institutions in every region of the country. Incidentally, we did not provide any definition of the term

"effective" for our nominators because we were not interested in injecting our own biases or in erecting artificial barriers during the identification process. After one follow-up round, 222 people or 46% of the population responded (Tables 1 and 2), resulting in the identification of 412 effective presidents (Table 3). For comparative purposes, a stratified random sample of 412 college and university presidents representing every sector and region of the country was then selected (Tables 3 and 4).

The data-collection instrument, the Fisher-Tack Effective Leadership Inventory (Appendix A), was developed and pilot tested with 400 college and university presidents. The presidents selected for involvement in the pilot testing of 109 potential items represented each sector of higher education and each region of the country. Factor analysis was then performed on the responses from the 256 (64%) presidents and 40 statements clustered in five factors were included in Part I (Table 5). The five factors were management style, human relations, image, social reference, and confidence. A panel of experts verified the demographic variables included in Parts II and III of the inventory.

The instrument was distributed to 824 presidents (412 effective and 412 representative), and 615 or 75% responded; interestingly 312 (76%) of the persons designated as effective responded while 303 (74%) of the representative group returned the survey instrument (Table 6). Data collected were analyzed to determine if differences existed between effective and representative presidents in terms of demographic variables or leadership attitudes and behaviors as measured by the self-report instrument. In order to find out as much

as we possibly could about leadership effectiveness, we compared the responses of effective and representative presidents and also analyzed the results using frequency of nomination as a variable. In addition, we looked for differences in responses by item as well as by factor, i.e., the five factors contained within the instrument. (See Appendices B-H for more information about the statistical tests and the results.)

In addition to the quantitative data obtained through use of the instrument, interviews were completed with 18 people, representing every sector of higher education, who were among the most frequently nominated presidents in the country. The campus-based interviews were viewed as a mechanism for gaining additional insight about presidential effectiveness.

The Results

Our research results show that there are distinct differences in the leadership behaviors and attitudes of effective college presidents as compared to their representative counterparts. Specifically, we found that effective and representative presidents differed significantly in their responses to the items included in the confidence factor ($p < .03$) and that they also viewed leadership differently in a number of other areas. In interpreting the results, we have developed several guidelines that those interested in being more effective college presidents may want to consider.

Effective Leaders Exude and Engender Confidence

Effective college presidents must be confident in their ability to lead an institution. In our study, we found that effective presidents scored higher on the confidence index than their representative counterparts ($p < .03$). Therefore, as far as we are concerned, presidents must truly believe they can make a difference and must be able to convince others that they know what to do. Without a healthy dose of confidence in their ability to analyze situations and make the right decision at the right time, presidents cannot lead.

In support of this idea, Bennis and Nannus (1985) said: "The most astonishing result of positive self-regard came as something of a surprise to us . . . . What we observed was that our ninety leaders induced (stemming from their own self-regard) positive other-regard in their employees" (p. 62). We feel it is safe to conclude that leaders who have confidence in themselves inspire confidence in others. As Bennis and Nannus (1985) noted, effective leaders "know their worth. They trust themselves without letting their ego or image get in the way" (pp. 57-58).

Interestingly, we found that representative presidents reported that they dress well to a greater degree than effective chief executive officers ($p < .05$). Perhaps the representative presidents are focusing too heavily on outward appearance rather than inward strength. This is not to suggest that effective presidents do not dress well; they simply do not attribute their success to the cut of their suit.

Effectiveness and Winning Are Inextricably Linked

Effective leaders focus on winning and do not even consider failure as an alternative. As Bennis and Nannus (1985) concluded:

> Perhaps the most impressive and memorable quality of the leaders we studied was the way they responded to failure. Like Karl Wallenda, the great tightrope aerialist--whose life was at stake each time he walked the tightrope--these leaders put all their energies into their task. They simply don't think about failure, don't even use the word . . . (p. 69)

Reed (1982) added these thoughts: "The mere possession of a sound purpose is not enough. It is necessary to be charged, and surcharged, with a mighty emotion. There must be a will to win. There must be an abounding sense of joy, and a strong supporting drive. It must be self-assertive and self-sustaining" (p. 167).

In addition, effective presidents are not constrained by organizational structure but go directly to the heart of any problem that exists, even if the problem is five levels removed from them. As our study revealed, representative presidents believe more strongly than effective presidents in organizational structure ($p < .05$). Effective leaders do not hesitate to pick up the telephone and call a faculty member in order to get information rather than wait for weeks to get a reply through the chain of command. We maintain that effective presidents believe structure is important in order to get the work of higher education accomplished; however they use the structure to their advantage and do not allow it to impede their efforts.

Effective Leaders Focus on Goal Achievement and the Accomplishment of a Vision

In order to be successful, chief executive officers need to have a dream: a sense of a more rewarding future for the institution as well as higher education in general and the wisdom necessary to accomplish the dream. As Greenleaf (1977) said, "Behind every great achievement is a dreamer of great dreams" (p. 16). In keeping with this thought, we found that the more frequently nominated effective presidents see themselves as greater risk-takers, i.e., presidents nominated two or more times believe that effective leaders take more risks than presidents nominated only once ($p < .04$). Clearly, effective presidents do not take risks just to be taking them, instead they carefully consider the alternatives and move forward when the situation warrants it. As Gardner (1987) stated, "Clearly a leader needs courage--not just bravery of the moment but courage over time, not just willingness to risk but to risk again and again, to function well under prolonged stress, to survive defeat and keep going" (p. 15). Kotter (1977) added that "Effective managers do not try to avoid risks. Instead, they look for prudent risks . . ." (p. 136).

The accomplishment of the dream is all important to effective presidents--popularity is not. As we found, when compared to their representative counterparts, effective presidents are less concerned about being liked ($p < .01$) and believe more strongly that the respect of those to be led is essential ($p < .04$). Therefore, the focus is on gaining the respect of those to be led rather than their affection.

In addition, the most effective presidents in our study (the 18 who were interviewed) believe less in the importance of achieving

consensus than all other effective presidents ($p < .02$). They recognize that in order to take advantage of situations they must seize the opportunity or lose momentum. So even though effective presidents recognize the necessity of input and involvement of those to be affected by a decision, they are willing to take the risks associated with moving forward even when the majority of the faculty, staff, students, or administrators are still interested in discussing the idea. Clearly, there must be a balance between seeking consensus and moving ahead; however, effective presidents know intuitively when to wait and when to charge forward.

It is also important to remember that effective presidents believe in close collegial relationships less than their representative counterparts ($p < .008$). We found that those who were nominated two or more times believe less in close collegial relationships than those who were nominated only once ($p < .04$), again reinforcing the notion that presidents must be prepared to take risks based on objectivity rather than on emotion.

The 18 interviewed presidents did not appear to make decisions as easily as the other effective presidents ($p < .03$). These highly acclaimed presidents recognize that they have to make the hard decisions, but they do not want anyone to think the decisions were made flippantly or without forethought; this is especially true when personnel decisions are being made.

Effective presidents are different from their representative counterparts on yet another dimension: representative presidents believe in the institution at all costs to a greater degree than do effective presidents ($p < .005$). On the surface this finding may

appear to contradict the notion of having a dream and working hard for its accomplishment. However, we believe that effective presidents are so committed to their vision for higher education and feel so strongly about the importance of higher education to societal improvement that they will, in fact, sacrifice short-term recognition for the institution in order to make significant contributions to higher education in general. Once again, we find that effective presidents are not tied to any institution or any individual but to a vision for a better tomorrow.

The Effective Leader Must Be Willing to Work Longer Hours than Anyone Else

Effective presidents reported that they tend to work long hours to a greater degree than their representative colleagues ($p < .006$). As Gardner (1987) said, "Top leaders have stamina and great reserves of vitality . . . energy to convene meetings after a hard day's work, to chair long and heated debates, to represent groups before the city council, and so on" (pp. 12-13). We believe it is safe to conclude that effective leaders are willing to devote whatever amount of time it takes to get the job done--to realize the dream. Fortunately, they are usually able to pack more into an hour than others because they think and act fast and are willing to make the hard decisions as well as suffer the consequences. In other words, effective presidents recognize that there is no short cut to success.

Effective Leaders Exercise Self-Control and Restraint

Effectiveness and predictability are important elements of leadership. Clearly, effective leaders cannot lose their temper frequently nor can they brainstorm ideas in public for fear that

someone will label the wrong idea as the one the president supports. Thus, effective leaders recognize that what is said cannot be unsaid. Gardner's (1987) words seem to sum up the importance of thinking through everything:

> Communication is of course the prime instrument of the leader-motivator, and all leaders take their communicating seriously. One of his closest friends said that Churchill spent a good part of his life rehearsing impromptu speeches. One day his valet, having drawn his master's bath shortly before, heard Churchill's voice booming out from the bathroom. The valet stuck his head in to find out if anything was needed. Churchill, immersed in the bathtub, said, "I was not speaking to you, Norman, I was addressing the House of Commons." (p. 15)

As we found, representative presidents report that they speak spontaneously to a greater degree than effective presidents ($p < .0001$). We also found that the more frequently a president was nominated the less likely he or she was to speak spontaneously ($p < .01$).

Effective Leaders Are Independent, Self-Assured Spirits

Given the fact that effective presidents focus on respect rather than popularity and are more generally loners than colleagues, we believe they are open-minded, independent thinkers. Because they are confident in their own abilities, they seek out those who think differently and learn from them. According to Miller (1983), effective leaders "value disagreement and see it as beneficial to problem resolution" (p. 11). Along this line of thought, we found

that the 18 presidents who were interviewed encouraged creativity (even though often they disagreed with the ideas being discussed) to a greater extent than all of the other effective presidents ($p < .05$).

Conclusion

It is clear to us that leaders are made and not born and that there are certain base-line behaviors that effective leaders have in common. In other words, while effective leaders do not look alike nor are their leadership styles identical, there are discernable behaviors and attitudes that separate them from their representative counterparts. According to our study, effective leaders exude confidence in their own abilities and engender confidence in others. Perhaps this confidence is fed by their "winning" spirit, their work ethic, and their self-control as well as restraint. They lead with their eyes focused on the future, working long hours to improve higher education in general and society in particular.

It is evident that strong, decisive leaders are needed now for higher education institutions--it is also apparent that there are presidents who will lead, if we will just allow them to do so. What we need to do is establish an environment where dedicated, visionary, effective presidents can exercise their creativity and leadership.

REFERENCES

American Council on Education/Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. (1986). Deciding who shall lead: Recommendations for improving presidential searches. Washington, DC.

Astin, A. W., & Scherrei, R. A. (1980). Maximizing leadership effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Belgum, D. (1970). Office of the presidency in denominational schools. Theological Education, 6, 294-303.

Benezet, L. T., Katz, J., & Magnusson, F. W. (1981). Style and substance leadership and the college presidency. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: The strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper & Row.

Bolman, F. (1965). How college presidents are chosen. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Burke, J. C. (1977). Coping with the role of college or university president. Educational Record, 58(4), 388-402.

Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.

Cameron, K. S., & Whetten, D. A. (1983). Organizational effectiveness: A comparison of multiple models. New York: Academic Press.

Cohen, M. D., & March, J. G. (1986). Leadership and ambiguity: The American college president. Boston: Harvard Business School.

Cowley, W. H. (1980). Presidents, professors, and trustees: The evolution of American academic government. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Drucker, P. F. (1967). The effective executive. New York: Harper and Row.

Ferrari, M. R. (1970). Profiles of American college presidents. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

Fisher, J. L. (1984). The power of the presidency. New York: ACE/Macmillan.

Fisher, J. L., & Quehl, G. H. (1984). Presidential assessment: Obstacle to leadership. Change, 16, 5-7.

Friedman, R. S. (1983). Presidential selection: Making it work. AGB Reports, 25, 44-46.

Gardner, J. W. (1987). Attributes and context. Leadership Papers/6. Washington, DC: Independent Sector.

Gilley, J. W., Fulmer, K. A., & Reithlingshoefer, S. J. (1986). Searching for academic excellence: Twenty colleges and universities on the move and their leaders. New York: ACE/Macmillan.

Gilli, A. C., Sr. (1976). The community junior college presidency: An inquiry. University Park, PA: Department of Vocational Education, Pennsylvania State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 123 469)

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). Servant leadership. New York: Paulist.

Jenkins, W. O. (1947). A review of leadership studies with particular reference to military problems. Psychological Bulletin, 44, 54-79.

Johnson, S. E. (1964). The seminary president--teacher of students and confidant of trustees. Theological Education, 1, 65-69.

Kauffman, J. F. (1984). Profile of the presidency in the next decade. Educational Record, 65, 6-10.

Kerr, C. (1984). Presidents make a difference: Strengthening leadership in colleges and universities: A report of the commission on strengthening presidential leadership. Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

Kerr, C. (1982). Crises in leadership. AGB Reports, 24, 4-7.

Kotter, J. P. (1977). Power, dependence, and effective management. Harvard Business Review, 55, 125-136.

Miller, E. L. (1983). University leaders: Having style rather than simply a style. Change, 15(1), 10-11.

Nason, J. W. (1980). Presidential assessment: A challenge to college and university leadership. Washington: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

Nason, J. W. (1984). Presidential search: A guide to the process of selecting and appointing college and university presidents. Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

Pruitt, G. (1974). Blueprint for leadership: The American college presidency. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities, Cincinnati.

Reed, H. W. (1982). The dynamics of leadership. Danville, IL: Interstate.

Sharp, P. F. (1984). American college presidents since World War II. Educational Record, 65(2), 11-16.

Shaw, E. P. (1980). The social distance factor and management. Personnel Administration, 28, 29-31.

Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. Journal of Psychology, 25, 35-71.

Weathersby, G. (1973). Purpose, persuasion, backbone, and spunk. In W. W. Jellema (Ed.), Efficient college management (pp. 3-10). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Yukl, G. A. (1981). Leadership in organizations. Englewood, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Table 1

Nominating Sample by Category

Category	Number Involved	Number Returned	Percentage
Qualified Observer			
Professional Association Head	15	8	53
Private Foundation Head	28	16	57
Scholar	35	14	40
Subtotal	78	38	49
Associate			
Four-Year Public President	83	37	45
Four-Year Private President	160	74	46
Two-Year Public President	142	68	48
Two-Year Private President	22	5	23
Subtotal	407	184	45
Total	485	222	46

Note. From THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE PRESIDENT by James L. Fisher, Martha W. Tack, Karen J. Wheeler. Copyright c 1988 by American Council on Education and Macmillan Publishing Company, a Division of Macmillan, Inc. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

Table 2

Nominating Sample by Region

Region	Number Involved
Northeast	42
Mid-Atlantic	79
South Atlantic	94
East South Central	29
East North Central	81
West North Central	51
West South Central	35
Mountain	20
Pacific	54
Total	485

Note. From THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE PRESIDENT by James L. Fisher, Martha W. Tack, Karen J. Wheeler. Copyright c 1988 by American Council on Education and Macmillan Publishing Company, a Division of Macmillan, Inc. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

Table 3

Distribution of Effective and Representative Presidents

Sector of Higher Education	Effective	Representative
Four-Year Public	120	76
Four-Year Private	183	165
Two-Year Public	106	145
Two-Year Private	3	26
Total	412	412

Note. From THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE PRESIDENT by James L. Fisher, Martha W. Tack, Karen J. Wheeler. Copyright c 1988 by American Council on Education and Macmillan Publishing Company, a Division of Macmillan, Inc. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

Table 4

Effective and Representative Presidents by Region

	Effective				Representative			
	Four-Year		Two-Year		Four-Year		Two-Year	
	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
Northeast	7	24	6	1	5	14	7	2
Mid-Atlantic	23	34	8	0	11	31	20	5
South Atlantic	23	35	20	1	14	26	27	5
West South Central	11	16	8	0	10	11	13	2
Pacific	10	19	18	0	5	22	26	1
Mountain	1	1	7	0	6	3	9	1
East South Central	11	13	3	1	6	6	11	3
East North Central	17	25	21	0	11	30	21	4
West North Central	17	16	15	0	8	22	11	3
Total	120	183	106	3	76	165	145	26

Note. From THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE PRESIDENT by James L. Fisher, Martha W. Tack, Karen J. Wheeler. Copyright c 1988 by American Council on Education and Macmillan Publishing Company, a Division of Macmillan, Inc. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

Table 5

Pilot-Test Participants

Region	Four-Year Public			Four-Year Private			Two-Year Private			Two-Year Private		
	Number Involved	Number Returned	Percentage	Number Involved	Number Returned	Percentage	Number Involved	Number Returned	Percentage	Number Involved	Number Returned	Percentage
Northeast	5	2	40	17	9	53	7	4	57	3	1	33
Mid-Atlantic	10	3	30	28	18	64	15	8	53	4	2	50
South Atlantic	14	8	57	26	16	62	26	20	77	2	1	50
East South Central	6	5	83	9	5	56	10	8	80	3	1	33
East North Central	7	7	100	28	15	54	30	18	60	3	2	67
West North Central	9	5	56	19	16	84	13	10	77	3	1	33
West South Central	11	8	73	12	8	67	13	7	54	1	0	0
Mountain	6	5	83	4	3	75	9	7	78	1	0	0
Pacific	7	5	71	12	9	75	26	19	73	1	0	0
Totals	75	48	64	155	99	64	149	101	68	21	8	38

Note. From THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE PRESIDENT by James L. Fisher, Martha W. Tack, Karen J. Wheeler. Copyright c 1988 by American Council on Education and Macmillan Publishing Company, a Division of Macmillan, Inc. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

Table 6

Composition of Responding Population

Category	Four-Year Public			Four-Year Private			Two-Year Public			Two-Year Private		
	Number Involved	Number Returned	Percentage	Number Involved	Number Returned	Percentage	Number Involved	Number Returned	Percentage	Number Involved	Number Returned	Percentage
Effective	120	95	79	183	127	69	106	87	82	3	3	100
Representative	76	61	80	165	108	66	145	116	80	26	18	69
Total	196	156	80	348	235	68	251	203	81	29	21	72

Note. From THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE PRESIDENT by James L. Fisher, Martha W. Tack, Karen J. Wheeler. Copyright c 1988 by American Council on Education and Macmillan Publishing Company, a Division of Macmillan, Inc. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

APPENDIX A

Fisher/Tack Effective Leadership Inventory

Directions: This questionnaire is designed to identify the characteristics of an effective college president (chancellor) and focuses on the following three areas: styles/attitudes, professional information, and personal data. Please provide the information in the format requested.

Part I: Personal Attitudes and Leadership Style

Please react to the following statements about your own characteristics as a leader by checking the appropriate responses. Your responses should represent your perceptions of yourself as a leader.

SA = Strongly Agree A = Agree UD = Undecided D = Disagree SD = Strongly Disagree

As a college president, I:

	SA	A	UD	D	SD
1. Am sometimes viewed as hard-nosed.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
2. Believe that the respect of those to be led is essential	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
3. Believe that an effective leader takes risks	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
4. Am primarily concerned about being liked	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
5. Try to achieve consensus	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
6. Believe in organizational structure.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
7. Believe that the leader should be perceived as self-confident	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
8. Believe in close collegial relationships	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
9. Believe that a leader serves the people.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
10. Believe in merit pay	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
11. Am sometimes viewed as assertive	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
12. Am rarely in keeping with the status quo	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
13. Delegate responsibility and authority to subordinates.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
14. Believe in the value of one-on-one meetings.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
15. Maintain a measure of mystique	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
16. Use large social functions to advance the institution.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
17. Choose another CEO as a confidant.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

		SA	A	UD	D	SD
18.	Believe in community involvement	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
19.	Always appear energetic.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
20.	Am often viewed as a loner	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
21.	Count committee meetings as mistakes	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
22.	Would rather be viewed as a strong leader than a good colleague	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
23.	Accept losses gracefully	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
24.	Tend to work long hours.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
25.	Often like people who are different.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
26.	Only occasionally speak spontaneously.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
27.	Am warm and affable.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
28.	Would rather be influential than professionally admired.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
29.	Dress well	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
30.	Deeply care about the welfare of the individual.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
31.	Believe in the institution at all costs.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
32.	Encourage creative types even though often in disagreement	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
33.	Appear to make decisions easily.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
34.	Appear confident even when in doubt.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
35.	View myself and the institution as one	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
36.	Am often seen as somewhat aloof.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
37.	Enjoy stirring things up	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
38.	Am rarely viewed as flamboyant	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
39.	Appear to enjoy the perquisites of office.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
40.	Smile a lot.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

Part II: Professional Data

Degrees Earned:

Doctorate: No . . . [ ]

Yes. . . [ ]

If yes, type of degree:

PhD. . . [ ] DFA. . . [ ] JD. . . [ ] Other (specify). . . [ ]

EdD. . . [ ] DBA. . . [ ] MD. . . [ ] _____

Institution Granting Degree: _____

Type of Institution: Public. . . . . [ ]

Private . . . . . [ ]

Major: _____

Master's: No . . . [ ]

Yes. . . [ ]

If yes, type of degree:

MA. . . [ ] MBA. . . [ ] Other (specify). . . [ ]

MEd . . [ ] MFA. . . [ ] _____

Institution Granting Degree: _____

Type of Institution: Public. . . . . [ ]

Private . . . . . [ ]

Major: _____

Baccalaureate: No . . . [ ]

Yes. . . [ ]

If yes, type of degree:

BS. . . [ ] BFA. . . [ ]

BA. . . [ ] Other (specify). . . [ ]

_____

Institution Granting Degree: _____

Type of Institution: Public . . . . . [ ]

Private. . . . . [ ]

Major: _____

Previous Experience:

Positions Held in Higher Education (Beginning with the first position, indicate the offices you have held using the codes listed below. When designating associate or assistant positions, codes should be combined, e.g., JE = assistant dean. If you changed institutions but kept the same title, please make separate entries for each position occupied. Additionally, please refer to the institutional codes when identifying the type of institution at which you were employed.)

Position Codes

A - Full-time Faculty Member
B - Department Chairperson
C - Coordinator
D - Director
E - Dean
F - Assistant-to-the
G - Vice President
H - President
I - Associate
J - Assistant
K - Other

Institutional Codes

1 - 4-year, Public
2 - 4-year, Private
3 - 2-year, Public
4 - 2-year, Private

Position Chronology	Position Code	Area	Years in Position	Type of Institution
1	_____	_____	_____	_____
2	_____	_____	_____	_____
3	_____	_____	_____	_____
4	_____	_____	_____	_____
5	_____	_____	_____	_____
6	_____	_____	_____	_____
7	_____	_____	_____	_____
8	_____	_____	_____	_____
9	_____	_____	_____	_____
10	_____	_____	_____	_____
11	_____	_____	_____	_____
12	_____	_____	_____	_____

Total Years in Higher Education Administration: _____

Total Years of Experience Outside Higher Education: _____

Total Years in Presidential Position: _____

Age Upon Assumption of First Presidency: _____

Current Position:

Years in Current Presidency: _____

Type of Institution: Public. . . [ ] Two-Year. . . [ ]

Private . . [ ] Four-Year . . [ ]

Student Population (Headcount) of Campus: _____

Salary: _____

Scholarly Activity

Number of Books Published: _____

Approximate Number of Articles in Refereed Journals: _____

Approximate Number of Professional Organization Memberships: _____

Two Professional Organizations in Which You Participate Frequently:

Organization #1: _____

Office(s) Held: _____

Organization #2: _____

Office(s) Held: _____

Part III: Personal Information

Age: _____

Sex: Male. . . [ ]
Female. . [ ]

Religious Preference: Eastern Orthodox. . [ ]
Jewish. . . . . [ ]
Muslim. . . . . [ ]
Roman Catholic. . . [ ]
Protestant. . . . [ ]
Baptist. . . [ ]
Episcopal. . [ ]
Methodist. . [ ]
Presbyterian [ ]
Other (specify) . [ ]
_____

Race: American Indian . . . [ ]
Asian Indian . . . . [ ]
Black . . . . . [ ]
Caucasian . . . . . [ ]
Chinese . . . . . [ ]
Filipino. . . . . [ ]
Japanese. . . . . [ ]
Spanish/Hispanic. . . [ ]
Other (specify) . . . [ ]
_____

Marital Status: Never Married . . . [ ]
Divorced. . . . . [ ]
Widowed . . . . . [ ]
Now Married . . . . [ ]

Number of Marriages: 0 . . . . [ ]
1 . . . . [ ]
2 . . . . [ ]
3 . . . . [ ]
4 . . . . [ ]

Spouse's Occupation: (check one)

Professional (e.g., accountant, engineer, lawyer, doctor, etc.). . . . . [ ]

Manager, Business Official (e.g., finance manager, sales administrator, etc.). . . . . [ ]

Proprietor or Business Owner (e.g., contractor, gasoline dealership, etc.) . . . . . [ ]

Sales and Clerical (e.g., billing clerk, mail carrier, insurance sales, etc.). . . . . [ ]

Technician/Semi-Professional (e.g., draftsperson, surveyor, health therapy, etc.). . . . . [ ]

Craftsman or Foreman (e.g., carpenter, jeweler, mechanic, etc.). . . . . [ ]

Skilled Machine Operator (e.g., drill press, lathe, truck driver, etc.). . . . . [ ]

Service Worker (e.g., police officer, hospital orderly, barber, etc.). . . . . [ ]

Laborer (e.g., construction, factory, gas station, etc.) . . . . . [ ]

Farmer . . . . . [ ]

Other (specify) . . . . . [ ]

Number of Children: 0 . . . [ ]
1 . . . [ ]
2 . . . [ ]
3 . . . [ ]
4 . . . [ ]
5+. . . [ ]

Ages of Children: ____
____
____
____
____
____

State or Foreign Country of Birth: _____

State of Current Residence: _____

Political Affiliation: American Independent. . . [ ]
Democrat. . . . . [ ]
Republican. . . . . [ ]
Other (specify) . . . . . [ ]
_____

Father's Education: Less Than High School. . . [ ]
Some High School . . . . . [ ]
High School Diploma. . . . [ ]
College Courses. . . . . [ ]
Baccalaureate Degree . . . [ ]
Post-Baccalaureate Courses. . . [ ]
Master's Degree . . . . . [ ]
Doctoral Degree . . . . . [ ]
Post-Doctoral Work. . . . . [ ]

Mother's Education: Less Than High School. . . [ ]
Some High School . . . . . [ ]
High School Diploma. . . . [ ]
College Courses. . . . . [ ]
Baccalaureate Degree . . . [ ]
Post-Baccalaureate Courses. . . [ ]
Master's Degree . . . . . [ ]
Doctoral Degree . . . . . [ ]
Post-Doctoral Work. . . . . [ ]

Number of Siblings: Younger Brothers _____ Older Brothers _____
Younger Sisters _____ Older Sisters _____

Please return this instrument by December 15, 1985, to:

Bowling Green State University
ATTN: Dr. Martha W. Tack, EDAS
Bowling Green, OH 43403

11/7

© 1985 James L. Fisher and Martha W. Tack

Note. From THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE PRESIDENT by James L. Fisher, Martha W. Tack, Karen J. Wheeler. Copyright c 1988 by American Council on Education and Macmillan Publishing Company, a Division of Macmillan, Inc. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

Appendix B

Statistical Methodology

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were used to study personal attitudes, leadership style, and demographic profiles of college presidents:

H_1 There is no significant difference between the responses of effective and representative presidents regarding management style, human relations, confidence, social reference, and the image of the president.

H_{1a} There is no significant difference between and among the responses of effective presidents nominated one, two, and three or more times; interviewed presidents; and representative presidents.

H_2 There is no significant difference between effective and representative presidents regarding professional credentials and experiences, scholarly activities, and personal profiles.

The Instrument

The instrument used to gather data is a self-report inventory with three main sections. Part I is a series of statements (Items 1-40) to which respondents are asked to indicate their perceptions of themselves as leaders. We use a 5-point Likert scale where 1 equals "Strongly Agree" and 5 equals "Strongly Disagree," except for nine items where the point values for each response were reversed so that 5 equals "Strongly Agree" and 1 equals "Strongly Disagree." Furthermore, to ensure a maximum number of usable returned

responses, unanswered questions were assigned the value of 3, which was designated as "Undecided." Part II comprises a series of questions designed to elicit professional data, including detailed information related to degrees earned, previous experience, current position, and scholarly activity. Personal demographic data were collected in Part III. This information includes age, sex, race, religious preference, marital and familial data, political affiliation, place of birth and current residence, and parents' education.

Statistical Analysis

Data were processed using the SAS software system (SAS Institute Inc., 1985). Appropriate statistical methods were determined by classifying data according to type and number of groups to be compared.

We obtained descriptive statistics for all variables from a frequency distribution. Results were presented as absolute frequencies and adjusted percentages. Additionally, mean scores were calculated for Part I and items assigned numerical values in Part II and Part III of the Inventory.

We used analysis of variance (ANOVA), t-tests, and chi-square statistics to examine the relationship between variables. ANOVA was used to determine differences between personal attitudes and leadership style when three or more groups were under consideration. When the overall F ratios were significant, Scheffe's S method was used to make all possible comparisons among means. T-tests were performed to determine differences in mean scores on the descriptiveness of personal attitudes and leadership style questions

when two groups were under consideration. Chi-square was used to determine significant differences between groups on all demographic questions. For ANOVA, t-tests, and chi-square, significance was calculated at the .05 probability level.

Note. From THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE PRESIDENT by James L. Fisher, Martha W. Tack, Karen J. Wheeler. Copyright c 1988 by American Council on Education and Macmillan Publishing Company, a Division of Macmillan, Inc. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

Appendix C

Frequency of Response to Personal Attitudes and Leadership Style Items

Item	2-Year										4-Year									
	Effective (N=91)					Representative (N=129)					Effective (N=221)					Representative (N=174)				
	SA	A	NO	D	SD	SA	A	NO	D	SD	SA	A	NO	D	SD	SA	A	NO	D	SD
1. Am sometimes viewed as hard-nosed	16	55	7	13	0	19	82	10	14	4	34	130	17	34	6	35	99	9	29	2
2. Believe that the respect of those to be led is essential	70	21	0	0	0	95	31	1	2	0	170	51	0	0	0	121	51	2	0	0
3. Believe that an effective leader takes risks	63	28	0	0	0	91	37	1	0	0	147	70	3	1	0	115	57	2	0	0
† 4. Am primarily concerned about being liked	19	64	8	0	0	21	87	21	0	0	44	159	18	0	0	19	140	15	0	0
5. Try to achieve consensus	18	67	4	1	1	11	104	5	9	0	50	146	7	16	2	28	130	8	8	0
6. Believe in organizational structure	31	56	4	0	0	44	82	2	1	0	52	147	16	5	1	48	118	5	3	0
7. Believe that the leader should be perceived as self-confident	59	30	0	2	0	78	51	0	0	0	116	101	4	0	0	99	72	2	0	1
† 8. Believe in close collegial relationships	26	60	5	0	0	23	93	13	0	0	67	138	16	0	0	45	107	22	0	0
† 9. Believe that a leader serves the people	46	38	6	1	0	75	50	3	1	0	115	83	15	8	0	84	77	11	2	0
10. Believe in merit pay	18	33	28	10	2	24	64	28	11	2	110	91	13	6	1	82	67	17	7	1
11. Am sometimes viewed as assertive	30	56	2	3	0	36	79	8	6	0	73	119	22	7	0	58	104	7	5	0
†12. Am rarely in keeping with the status quo	8	34	17	32	0	16	49	25	35	4	25	70	50	74	2	17	65	38	53	1
13. Delegate responsibility and authority to subordinates	55	36	0	0	0	73	56	0	0	0	105	115	1	0	0	66	101	5	2	0
14. Believe in the value of one-on-one meetings	42	48	1	0	0	79	48	2	0	0	101	117	3	0	0	70	101	3	0	0
15. Maintain a measure of mystique	8	36	13	28	6	11	44	25	42	7	20	76	43	67	15	17	72	29	42	14
16. Use large social functions to advance the institution	17	41	9	22	2	22	58	17	30	2	53	130	16	22	0	40	98	17	18	1
†17. Choose another CEO as a confidant	10	38	19	21	3	14	57	23	32	3	22	69	47	78	5	16	64	32	58	4
18. Believe in community involvement	60	26	4	1	0	91	34	4	0	0	114	96	9	2	0	88	79	7	0	0
19. Always appear energetic	35	48	7	1	0	42	72	9	6	0	74	119	18	10	0	56	92	17	9	0
20. Am often viewed as a loner	3	25	14	40	9	5	35	20	58	11	11	64	43	89	14	6	64	33	58	13
†21. Count committee meetings as mistakes	1	4	13	54	19	3	7	15	72	32	1	12	20	150	38	3	13	26	110	22
22. Would rather be viewed as a strong leader than a good colleague	21	40	18	12	0	27	72	20	9	1	33	112	42	33	1	33	89	29	22	1
23. Accept losses gracefully	6	50	14	21	0	6	77	15	28	3	18	138	29	35	1	17	91	26	39	1
24. Tend to work long hours	33	45	6	7	0	36	76	4	13	0	109	97	10	4	1	66	90	9	9	0
†25. Often like people who are different	13	60	15	3	0	21	78	22	7	1	35	135	38	12	1	33	104	26	11	0
26. Only occasionally speak spontaneously	1	14	4	55	17	1	35	9	66	18	7	28	13	117	56	9	38	13	86	28
27. Am warm and affable	11	50	18	12	0	23	69	26	11	0	29	141	39	11	1	22	111	33	8	0
†28. Would rather be influential than professionally admired	7	18	29	36	1	8	41	27	46	7	10	69	70	62	10	14	55	49	52	4
29. Dress well	27	54	9	1	0	39	79	10	0	1	35	147	27	11	1	27	126	19	2	0
30. Deeply care about the welfare of the individual	48	38	4	1	0	69	51	6	2	1	116	92	10	3	0	72	93	9	0	0

Appendix C (continued)

Item	2-Year										4-Year									
	Effective					Representative					Effective					Representative				
	SA	A	NO	D	SD	SA	A	NO	D	SD	SA	A	NO	D	SD	SA	A	NO	D	SD
31. Believe in the institution at all costs	13	53	25	0	0	25	80	24	0	0	32	155	34	0	0	35	122	17	0	0
32. Encourage creative types even though often in disagreement	22	59	9	1	0	31	84	11	2	1	44	161	11	5	0	33	119	21	1	0
†33. Appear to make decisions easily	17	59	9	5	1	18	78	17	16	0	35	135	30	21	0	26	113	18	17	0
34. Appear confident even when in doubt	13	62	14	2	0	13	88	14	12	2	29	126	36	29	1	16	116	26	16	0
35. View myself and the institution as one	6	36	12	34	3	20	51	13	42	3	27	75	19	80	20	18	52	22	68	14
36. Am often seen as somewhat aloof	2	28	14	39	8	4	48	21	50	6	8	68	33	94	18	4	53	34	67	16
37. Enjoy stirring things up	3	27	13	38	10	9	33	14	52	21	4	62	35	92	28	8	55	30	62	19
38. Am rarely viewed as flamboyant	8	69	14	0	0	15	97	17	0	0	31	151	39	0	0	21	123	30	0	0
39. Appear to enjoy the perquisites of the office	4	49	20	17	1	11	63	28	25	2	9	86	65	56	5	7	73	52	41	1
40. Smile a lot	21	49	13	8	0	24	71	16	18	0	44	130	27	20	0	40	94	22	17	1

†Reversed Item

Note. From THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE PRESIDENT by James L. Fisher, Martha W. Tack, Karen J. Wheeler. Copyright c 1988 by American Council on Education and Macmillan Publishing Company, a Division of Macmillan, Inc. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

Appendix D

Comparison of Personal Attitudes and Leadership Style of Effective Presidents
Nominated One, Two, and Three or More Times; Interviewed Presidents; and Representative Presidents

Item	Nominated Once (n=196)	Nominated Twice (n=46)	Nominated Three or More (n=55)	Interviewed (n=15)	Representative (n=303)	F Value	p
1. Am sometimes viewed as hard-nosed	2.31	2.35	2.13	2.20	2.23	0.55	.70
2. Believe that the respect of those to be led is essential	1.24	1.17	1.22	1.33	1.31	1.44	.22
3. Believe that an effective leader takes risks	1.39	1.28	1.25	1.20	1.33	1.40	.23
† 4. Am primarily concerned about being liked	1.89	1.93	1.85	1.67	1.99	2.48	.04*
5. Try to achieve consensus	1.96	1.91	1.84	2.40	2.03	2.44	.05*
6. Believe in organizational structure	1.84	1.74	1.85	2.13	1.75	2.19	.07
7. Believe that the leader should be perceived as self-confident	1.48	1.30	1.51	1.60	1.43	1.45	.22
† 8. Believe in close collegial relationships	1.82	1.61	1.76	1.67	1.89	3.18	.01**
† 9. Believe that a leader serves the people	1.56	1.50	1.53	1.67	1.52	0.35	.85
10. Believe in merit pay	1.88	2.07	1.64	1.67	1.95	2.05	.09
11. Am sometimes viewed as assertive	1.82	1.91	1.69	1.80	1.81	0.67	.62
†12. Am rarely in keeping with the status quo	2.10	2.11	2.15	2.00	2.08	0.25	.91
13. Delegate responsibility and authority to subordinates	1.52	1.39	1.49	1.40	1.57	1.52	.19
14. Believe in the value of one-on-one meetings	1.56	1.57	1.53	1.60	1.52	0.19	.94
15. Maintain a measure of mystique	2.89	2.85	2.96	2.93	2.85	0.15	.96
16. Use large social functions to advance the institution	2.21	2.02	2.05	2.27	2.25	0.95	.43
†17. Choose another CEO as a confidant	2.08	2.11	2.04	2.20	2.06	0.35	.85
18. Believe in community involvement	1.50	1.59	1.45	1.47	1.45	0.69	.60
19. Always appear energetic	1.81	1.83	1.71	1.93	1.86	0.59	.67
20. Am often viewed as a loner	3.19	3.20	3.16	3.13	3.14	.08	.99
†21. Count committee meetings as mistakes	1.96	1.78	1.91	1.73	1.94	1.50	.20
22. Would rather be viewed as a strong leader than a good colleague	2.25	2.43	2.51	2.13	2.19	1.99	.09
23. Accept losses gracefully	2.46	2.26	2.36	2.73	2.54	1.50	.20
24. Tend to work long hours	1.72	1.61	1.65	1.40	1.85	2.64	.03*
†25. Often like people who are different	2.05	2.02	1.93	1.87	1.98	0.85	.49
26. Only occasionally speak spontaneously	3.71	4.17	3.91	4.07	3.50	5.89	.0001***
27. Am warm and affable	2.27	2.09	2.13	2.20	2.17	0.83	.51
†28. Would rather be influential than professionally admired	2.24	2.24	2.18	2.20	2.14	0.92	.45
29. Dress well	2.00	2.00	1.98	2.13	1.90	1.09	.36
30. Deeply care about the welfare of the individual	1.58	1.59	1.42	1.40	1.61	1.29	.27
31. Believe in the institution at all costs	2.79	3.13	2.98	2.67	2.61	3.12	.01**
32. Encourage creative types even though often in disagreement	1.93	1.83	1.87	1.60	1.92	1.39	.23

Appendix D (continued)

Item	Nominated Once	Nominated Twice	Nominated Three or More	Interviewed	Representative	F Value	p
†33. Appear to make decisions easily	1.99	1.89	1.96	1.67	1.97	1.55	.19
34. Appear confident even when in doubt	2.22	2.28	2.31	2.00	2.24	0.51	.73
35. View myself and the institution as one	2.90	2.98	3.07	2.93	2.88	0.33	.86
36. Am often seen as somewhat aloof	3.19	3.39	3.22	3.13	3.15	0.56	.69
37. Enjoy stirring things up	3.38	3.30	3.25	3.00	3.24	0.75	.56
38. Am rarely viewed as flamboyant	2.45	2.26	2.35	2.73	2.47	0.97	.42
39. Appear to enjoy the perquisites of the office	2.76	2.65	2.76	3.07	2.67	0.91	.46
40. Smile a lot	2.16	1.89	2.00	2.27	2.16	1.42	.23
Management Style Index	33.64	33.09	32.44	33.67	33.54	0.84	.50
Human Relations Index	20.98	21.04	20.82	20.47	20.56	0.41	.80
Image Index	10.04	9.80	10.15	10.27	9.95	0.23	.92
Social Reference Index	14.53	14.17	14.09	14.47	14.42	0.77	.55
Confidence Index	6.87	7.13	7.09	6.33	6.66	2.35	.05*

*p <.05
**p <.01
***p <.0001
†Reversed Item

Note. From THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE PRESIDENT by James L. Fisher, Martha W. Tack, Karen J. Wheeler. Copyright c 1988 by American Council on Education and Macmillan Publishing Company, a Division of Macmillan, Inc. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

Appendix E

Comparison of Personal Attitudes and Leadership Style of Effective and Representative Presidents

Item	Effective (n=312; df=311) $\bar{X}$ Response	SD	Representative (n=303; df=302) $\bar{X}$ Response	SD	t	p
1. Am sometimes viewed as hard-nosed	2.28	0.97	2.23	0.97	0.61	.54
2. Believe that the respect of those to be led is essential	1.23	0.42	1.31	0.52	-2.07	.04*
3. Believe that an effective leader takes risks	1.34	0.51	1.33	0.49	0.32	.75
† 4. Am primarily concerned about being liked	1.88	0.52	1.99	0.50	-2.55	.01**
5. Try to achieve consensus	1.96	0.75	2.03	0.63	-1.28	.20
6. Believe in organizational structure	1.84	0.63	1.75	0.56	1.95	.05*
7. Believe that the leader should be perceived as self-confident	1.46	0.56	1.43	0.55	0.73	.47
† 8. Believe in close collegial relationships	1.77	0.56	1.89	0.57	-2.67	.008**
† 9. Believe that a leader serves the people	1.55	0.62	1.52	0.59	0.61	.54
10. Believe in merit pay	1.85	0.90	1.95	0.91	-1.30	.20
11. Am sometimes viewed as assertive	1.81	0.71	1.81	0.69	-0.02	.99
†12. Am rarely in keeping with the status quo	2.10	0.56	2.08	0.57	0.44	.66
13. Delegate responsibility and authority to subordinates	1.49	0.51	1.57	0.56	-1.86	.06
14. Believe in the value of one-on-one meetings	1.55	0.52	1.52	0.53	0.70	.49
15. Maintain a measure of mystique	2.90	1.13	2.85	1.13	0.57	.57
16. Use large social functions to advance the institution	2.16	0.95	2.25	0.99	-1.24	.22
†17. Choose another CEO as a confidant	2.08	0.58	2.06	0.55	0.53	.60
18. Believe in community involvement	1.50	0.63	1.45	0.57	1.20	.23
19. Always appear energetic	1.80	0.73	1.86	0.77	-1.00	.32
20. Am often viewed as a loner	3.19	1.07	3.14	1.07	0.51	.61
†21. Count committee meetings as mistakes	1.92	0.54	1.94	0.57	-0.46	.65
22. Would rather be viewed as a strong leader than a good colleague	2.32	0.93	2.19	0.89	1.75	.08
23. Accept losses gracefully	2.43	0.88	2.54	0.96	-1.50	.13
24. Tend to work long hours	1.68	0.76	1.85	0.81	-2.78	.006**
†25. Often like people who are different	2.01	0.57	1.98	0.58	0.77	.44
26. Only occasionally speak spontaneously	3.83	1.02	3.50	1.11	3.90	.0001***
27. Am warm and affable	2.21	0.77	2.17	0.75	0.65	.52
†28. Would rather be influential than professionally admired	2.23	0.60	2.14	0.58	1.80	.07
29. Dress well	2.00	0.71	1.90	0.60	1.94	.05*
30. Deeply care about the welfare of the individual	1.54	0.64	1.61	0.65	-1.20	.23
31. Believe in the institution at all costs	2.87	1.11	2.61	1.15	2.80	.005**
32. Encourage creative types even though often in disagreement	1.89	0.58	1.92	0.62	-0.68	.50
†33. Appear to make decisions easily	1.96	0.54	1.97	0.51	-0.36	.72
34. Appear confident even when in doubt	2.23	0.82	2.24	0.78	-0.11	.91
35. View myself and the institution as one	2.95	1.20	2.88	1.19	0.63	.53
36. Am often seen as somewhat aloof	3.22	1.07	3.15	1.05	0.89	.38
37. Enjoy stirring things up	3.33	1.08	3.24	1.17	1.02	.31
38. Am rarely viewed as flamboyant	2.42	0.93	2.47	0.96	-0.64	.52
39. Appear to enjoy the perquisites of the office	2.76	0.92	2.67	0.92	1.17	.24
40. Smile a lot	2.10	0.83	2.16	0.90	-0.80	.42
Management Style Index	33.35	4.89	35.54	4.40	-0.50	.62
Human Relations Index	20.94	3.89	20.56	4.12	1.16	.25
Image Index	10.04	2.37	9.95	2.32	0.45	.65
Social Reference Index	14.39	1.94	14.42	1.83	-0.19	.85
Confidence Index	6.92	1.37	6.66	1.52	2.23	.03*

*p <.05
**p <.01
***p <.0001
†Reversed Item

Note. From THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE PRESIDENT by James L. Fisher, Martha W. Tack, Karen J. Wheeler. Copyright c 1988 by American Council on Education and Macmillan Publishing Company, a Division of Macmillan, Inc. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

Appendix F

Comparison of Personal Attitudes and Leadership Style of Presidents Nominated One Time and Those Nominated Two or More Times

Item	One Nomination (n=198; df=197) $\bar{X}$ Response	SD	Two or More Nominations (n=114; df=113) $\bar{X}$ Response	SD	t	p
1. Am sometimes viewed as hard-nosed	2.30	1.00	2.24	0.91	0.54	.59
2. Believe that the respect of those to be led is essential	1.24	0.43	1.22	0.42	0.36	.72
3. Believe that an effective leader takes risks	1.39	0.52	1.26	0.50	2.09	.04*
† 4. Am primarily concerned about being liked	1.88	0.53	1.88	0.50	0.11	.91
5. Try to achieve consensus	1.96	0.78	1.94	0.68	0.30	.77
6. Believe in organizational structure	1.83	0.64	1.86	0.62	-0.42	.67
7. Believe that the leader should be perceived as self-confident	1.48	0.56	1.44	0.56	0.62	.53
† 8. Believe in close collegial relationships	1.82	0.54	1.68	0.58	2.05	.04*
† 9. Believe that a leader serves the people	1.57	0.62	1.55	0.61	0.54	.59
10. Believe in merit pay	1.88	0.89	1.81	0.92	0.68	.50
11. Am sometimes viewed as assertive	1.82	0.70	1.80	0.73	0.24	.81
†12. Am rarely in keeping with the status quo	2.10	0.57	2.11	0.55	-0.06	.95
13. Delegate responsibility and authority to subordinates	1.52	.51	1.45	0.50	1.14	.26
14. Believe in the value of one-on-one meetings	1.56	.51	1.54	0.55	0.27	.79
15. Maintain a measure of mystique	2.88	1.14	2.93	1.13	-0.34	.73
16. Use large social functions to advance the institution	2.20	.93	2.09	0.98	0.98	.33
†17. Choose another CEO as a confidant	2.09	0.57	2.08	0.60	0.10	.92
18. Believe in community involvement	1.49	0.65	1.52	0.58	-0.31	.76
19. Always appear energetic	1.81	0.74	1.79	0.72	0.22	.83
20. Am often viewed as a loner	3.20	1.06	3.17	1.08	0.24	.81
†21. Count committee meetings as mistakes	1.96	0.54	1.84	0.53	1.87	.06
22. Would rather be viewed as a strong leader than a good colleague	2.24	0.91	2.45	0.96	-1.87	.06
23. Accept losses gracefully	2.46	0.86	2.38	0.93	0.79	.43
24. Tend to work long hours	1.71	0.75	1.61	0.77	1.10	.27
†25. Often like people who are different	2.05	0.55	1.96	0.60	1.33	.19
26. Only occasionally speak spontaneously	3.72	1.04	4.03	0.95	-2.57	.01**
27. Am warm and affable	2.26	0.77	2.13	0.76	1.40	.16
†28. Would rather be influential than professionally admired	2.24	0.61	2.21	0.57	0.38	.70
29. Dress well	1.99	0.72	2.02	0.69	-0.27	.79
30. Deeply care about the welfare of the individual	1.58	0.67	1.48	0.60	1.30	.20
31. Believe in the institution at all costs	2.77	1.11	3.04	1.10	-2.06	.04*
32. Encourage creative types even though often in disagreement	1.93	0.61	1.82	0.52	1.73	.08
†33. Appear to make decisions easily	1.98	0.51	1.90	0.59	1.28	.20
34. Appear confident even when in doubt	2.22	0.81	2.26	0.83	-0.48	.63
35. View myself and the institution as one	2.89	1.17	3.04	1.26	-1.10	.27
36. Am often seen as somewhat aloof	3.19	1.09	3.28	1.05	-0.74	.46
37. Enjoy stirring things up	3.39	1.04	3.23	1.15	1.26	.21
38. Am rarely viewed as flamboyant	2.45	0.95	2.35	0.89	0.95	.34
39. Appear to enjoy the perquisites of the office	2.75	0.91	2.76	0.95	-0.10	.92
40. Smile a lot	2.16	0.87	2.00	0.74	1.61	.11
Management Style Index	33.60	4.92	32.91	4.83	1.20	.23
Human Relations Index	20.96	3.99	20.90	3.72	0.12	.90
Image Index	10.02	2.35	10.07	2.43	-0.20	.84
Social Reference Index	14.52	1.90	14.18	1.99	1.52	.13
Confidence Index	6.85	1.40	7.04	1.31	-1.18	.24

*p <.05
**p <.01
†Reversed Item

Note. From THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE PRESIDENT by James L. Fisher, Martha W. Tack, Karen J. Wheeler. Copyright c 1988 by American Council on Education and Macmillan Publishing Company, a Division of Macmillan, Inc. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

Appendix G

Comparison of Personal Attitudes and Leadership Style of Presidents Nominated Three or More Times and Those Nominated Less Than Three Times

Item	Three or More Nominations (n=67; df=66) $\bar{X}$ Response	SD	One or Two Nominations (n=245; df=244) $\bar{X}$ Response	SD	t	p
1. Am sometimes viewed as hard-nosed	2.18	0.92	2.30	0.98	-0.92	.36
2. Believe that the respect of those to be led is essential	1.25	0.44	1.22	0.42	0.50	.62
3. Believe that an effective leader takes risks	1.25	0.44	1.37	0.53	-1.61	.11
†4. Am primarily concerned about being liked	1.84	0.48	1.89	0.53	-0.81	.42
5. Try to achieve consensus	1.93	0.70	1.96	0.76	-0.37	.71
6. Believe in organizational structure	1.93	0.66	1.82	0.62	1.25	.21
7. Believe that the leader should be perceived as self-confident	1.54	0.61	1.44	0.55	1.20	.23
†8. Believe in close collegial relationships	1.75	0.61	1.78	0.55	-0.38	.71
†9. Believe that a leader serves the people	1.55	0.61	1.55	0.62	0.01	.99
10. Believe in merit pay	1.64	0.81	1.91	0.92	-2.17	.03*
11. Am sometimes viewed as assertive	1.73	0.62	1.83	0.73	-1.04	.30
†12. Am rarely in keeping with the status quo	2.11	0.59	2.10	0.56	0.28	.78
13. Delegate responsibility and authority to subordinates	1.49	.50	1.49	0.51	0.04	.97
14. Believe in the value of one-on-one meetings	1.54	.53	1.56	0.52	-0.30	.76
15. Maintain a measure of mystique	3.01	1.09	2.87	1.14	0.93	.35
16. Use large social functions to advance the institution	2.12	1.01	2.17	0.94	-0.37	.72
†17. Choose another CEO as a confidant	2.07	0.59	2.09	0.58	-0.14	.89
18. Believe in community involvement	1.48	0.59	1.51	0.64	-0.38	.71
19. Always appear energetic	1.78	0.79	1.81	0.71	-0.32	.75
20. Am often viewed as a loner	3.16	1.04	3.19	1.08	-0.19	.85
†21. Count committee meetings as mistakes	1.88	0.48	1.93	0.55	-0.62	.54
22. Would rather be viewed as a strong leader than a good colleague	2.43	1.03	2.29	0.91	1.14	.25
23. Accept losses gracefully	2.42	0.94	2.43	0.87	-0.12	.90
24. Tend to work long hours	1.63	0.79	1.69	0.75	-0.60	.55
†25. Often like people who are different	1.90	0.58	2.04	0.57	-1.90	.06
26. Only occasionally speak spontaneously	3.93	1.02	3.81	1.02	0.84	.40
27. Am warm and affable	2.16	0.83	2.22	0.75	-0.57	.57
†28. Would rather be influential than professionally admired	2.19	0.56	2.24	0.61	-0.52	.60
29. Dress well	2.03	0.72	2.00	0.70	0.35	.73
30. Deeply care about the welfare of the individual	1.42	0.61	1.58	0.65	-1.83	.07
31. Believe in the institution at all costs	3.00	1.03	2.83	1.13	1.12	.26
32. Encourage creative types even though often in disagreement	1.82	0.58	1.91	0.59	-1.11	.27
†33. Appear to make decisions easily	1.93	0.61	1.96	0.52	-0.51	.61
34. Appear confident even when in doubt	2.27	0.91	2.22	0.79	0.39	.70
35. View myself and the institution as one	3.12	1.30	2.90	1.17	1.34	.18
36. Am often seen as somewhat aloof	3.22	1.04	3.22	1.08	0.02	.98
37. Enjoy stirring things up	3.15	1.16	3.38	1.06	-1.55	.12
38. Am rarely viewed as flamboyant	2.43	0.89	2.41	0.94	0.16	.87
39. Appear to enjoy the perquisites of the office	2.84	0.98	2.73	0.91	0.79	.43
40. Smile a lot	2.07	0.74	2.11	0.85	-0.28	.78
Management Style Index	32.81	4.92	33.50	4.88	-1.03	.31
Human Relations Index	20.84	3.88	20.97	3.90	-0.25	.81
Image Index	10.30	2.70	9.96	2.28	1.02	.31
Social Reference Index	14.21	1.81	14.44	1.97	-0.88	.38
Confidence Index	7.04	1.25	6.89	1.41	0.82	.41

*p <.05
†Reversed Item

Note. From THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE PRESIDENT by James L. Fisher, Martha W. Tack, Karen J. Wheeler. Copyright c 1988 by American Council on Education and Macmillan Publishing Company, a Division of Macmillan, Inc. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

Appendix H

Comparison of Personal Attitudes and Leadership Style Between Interviewed Presidents and Those Nominated One or More Times

Item	Interviewed (n=15; df=14) $\bar{X}$ Response	SD	One or More Nominations (n=297; df=296) $\bar{X}$ Response	SD	t	p
1. Am sometimes viewed as hard-nosed	2.20	0.94	2.28	0.97	-0.31	.76
2. Believe that the respect of those to be led is essential	1.33	0.49	1.23	0.42	0.96	.34
3. Believe that an effective leader takes risks	1.20	0.41	1.35	0.52	-1.10	.27
† 4. Am primarily concerned about being liked	1.67	0.62	1.89	0.52	-1.64	.10
5. Try to achieve consensus	2.40	0.91	1.93	0.73	2.38	.02*
6. Believe in organizational structure	2.13	0.83	1.82	0.62	1.85	.06
7. Believe that the leader should be perceived as self-confident	1.60	0.83	1.46	0.54	0.66	.52
† 8. Believe in close collegial relationships	1.67	0.62	1.77	0.56	-0.73	.47
† 9. Believe that a leader serves the people	1.67	0.62	1.55	0.62	0.73	.46
10. Believe in merit pay	1.67	0.90	1.86	0.90	-0.82	.41
11. Am sometimes viewed as assertive	1.80	0.68	1.81	0.71	-0.06	.95
†12. Am rarely in keeping with the status quo	2.00	0.65	2.11	0.56	-0.72	.47
13. Delegate responsibility and authority to subordinates	1.40	0.51	1.49	0.51	-0.71	.48
14. Believe in the value of one-on-one meetings	1.60	0.51	1.55	0.52	0.34	.73
15. Maintain a measure of mystique	2.93	1.10	2.90	1.14	0.11	.91
16. Use large social functions to advance the institution	2.27	1.28	2.15	0.93	0.46	.65
†17. Choose another CEO as a confidant	2.20	0.56	2.08	0.58	0.80	.42
18. Believe in community involvement	1.47	0.74	1.51	0.62	-0.23	.82
19. Always appear energetic	1.93	0.88	1.79	0.72	0.72	.47
20. Am often viewed as a loner	3.13	1.13	3.19	1.07	-0.19	.85
†21. Count committee meetings as mistakes	1.73	0.46	1.90	0.54	-1.35	.17
22. Would rather be viewed as a strong leader than a good colleague	2.13	1.13	2.33	0.93	-0.78	.44
23. Accept losses gracefully	2.73	1.03	2.41	0.87	1.37	.17
24. Tend to work long hours	1.40	0.83	1.69	0.75	-1.45	.15
†25. Often like people who are different	1.87	0.64	2.02	0.57	-1.01	.31
26. Only occasionally speak spontaneously	4.07	0.80	3.82	1.03	0.91	.36
27. Am warm and affable	2.20	1.01	2.21	0.76	-0.06	.95
†28. Would rather be influential than professionally admired	2.20	0.56	2.22	0.60	-0.18	.85
29. Dress well	2.13	0.74	2.00	0.70	0.73	.47
30. Deeply care about the welfare of the individual	1.40	0.51	1.55	0.65	-0.89	.37
31. Believe in the institution at all costs	2.67	1.23	2.87	1.10	-0.71	.48
32. Encourage creative types even though often in disagreement	1.60	0.51	1.91	0.59	-1.99	.05*
†33. Appear to make decisions easily	1.67	0.62	1.97	0.54	-2.12	.03*
34. Appear confident even when in doubt	2.00	0.76	2.25	0.82	-1.14	.26
35. View myself and the institution as one	2.93	1.33	2.95	1.20	-0.04	.97
36. Am often seen as somewhat aloof	3.13	1.06	3.23	1.07	-0.32	.75
37. Enjoy stirring things up	3.00	1.36	3.35	1.07	-1.21	.23
38. Am rarely viewed as flamboyant	2.73	1.03	2.40	0.93	1.35	.18
39. Appear to enjoy the perquisites of the office	3.07	0.88	2.74	0.92	1.33	.18
40. Smile a lot	2.27	0.88	2.09	0.83	0.80	.42
Management Style Index	33.67	5.39	33.33	4.88	0.25	.79
Human Relations Index	20.46	3.02	20.96	3.93	-0.48	.63
Image Index	10.27	2.79	10.02	2.36	0.39	.70
Social Reference Index	14.47	1.30	14.39	1.96	0.14	.88
Confidence Index	6.33	1.68	6.95	1.35	-1.71	.08

*p <.05
†Reversed Items

Note. From THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE PRESIDENT by James L. Fisher, Martha W. Tack, Karen J. Wheeler. Copyright c 1988 by American Council on Education and Macmillan Publishing Company, a Division of Macmillan, Inc. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.